



Development of and Emissions Impacts of More Stringent ASM Cutpoints in the California Smog Check Program

Prepared for:
California Air Resources Board
Bureau of Automotive Repair

Prepared by:
Sierra Research, Inc.

Presented to:
California I/M Review Committee

January 24, 2006



Introduction

- Goal: Development of more stringent cutpoints that maximize identification of vehicles with significant emission control system defects while minimizing false failures.
- The ASM test measures emissions at two speed-load points.
- How can we improve our confidence that more stringent ASM cutpoints will identify defects that result in elevated emissions over a broader range of driving conditions?

A vertical strip on the left side of the slide shows a topographic map of a coastline. It features contour lines, a yellow line indicating a path or boundary, and various symbols representing geographical features.

General Approach

- Compare ASM failure rates in CA to failure rates in states running transient tests (IM147 and IM240).
- Vehicles with high ASM failure rates compared to IM147/IM240 should be left alone.
- Vehicles with low ASM failure rates compared to IM147/IM240 are candidates for more stringent ASM cutpoints.

"Vehicle Specific" Cutpoints

- Failures rates in CA were compared to failure rates in AZ (IM147) and WI (IM240) based on the following:

- Model Year (pre-1996 only)
- Manufacturer (e.g., GM, Toyota)
- Make (e.g., Chevrolet, Lexus)
- Model (e.g., Caprice, Camry)
- Engine Displacement
- Number of Cylinders
- Transmission Type

- For cases in which sample size was small (< 50), data were aggregated (e.g., Dodge Aries and Dodge Shadow would be combined if both were equipped with 4-cylinder, 2.2 liter engine and automatic transmission).

"Vehicle Specific" Failure Rates

(1992 - 3.1L - 6Cyl - AT - Pontiac)

- Vehicle-specific failure rates in each program were first compared to the model year average.
- In this example, failure rates are lower than average in CA; higher than average in AZ/WI:

| Program | Vehicle Failure Rate | MYR | Normalized Failure Rate |
|------------|-------------------------|-------|----------------------------|
| California | 10.7% | 18.9% | 0.57 |
| Arizona | 26.7% | 15.7% | 1.70 |
| Wisconsin | 23.0% | 18.9% | 1.22 |

"Relative Failure Ratios"

(1992 - 3.1L - 6Cyl - AT - Pontiac)

- The normalized failure rates from CA were then divided by the normalized failure rates from AZ/WI to develop "relative failure ratios" (RFRs).
- Vehicle groups with low RFRs are candidates for tighter cutpoints; vehicles with high RFRs are left alone.
- The RFRs for this vehicle group are:

$$\text{RFR}_{\text{AZ+WI}} = 0.57 / ((1.70 + 1.22) / 2) = 0.4$$

$$\text{RFR}_{\text{AZ}} = 0.57 / 1.70 = 0.3$$

$$\text{RFR}_{\text{WI}} = 0.57 / 1.22 = 0.5$$

Candidates for More Stringent ASM Cutpoints (1992 Model Year)

| Make | Disp | Cyl | Trans | CA Failure Rate (%) | AZ Failure Rate (%) | WI Failure Rate (%) | Relative Failure Ratios | | |
|---------------------|------|-----|-------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|
| | | | | | | | vs AZ+WI | vs AZ | vs WI |
| All Vehicles | All | All | All | 18.9 | 15.7 | 18.9 | -- | -- | -- |
| CHRYSLER | 3.8 | V6 | A | 3.2 | 9.7 | 20.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| BUICK | 3.1 | V6 | A | 6.1 | 23.4 | 20.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| OLDSMOBILE | 3.1 | V6 | A | 7.4 | 29.4 | 22.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| CHRYSLER | 3.0 | V6 | A | 5.4 | 16.2 | 17.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| MERCURY | 2.3 | L4 | A | 2.5 | 5.7 | 9.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| SUBARU | 1.8 | H4 | A | 2.6 | 13.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | >>1 |
| FORD/MAZDA | 2.2 | L4 | A | 2.4 | 8.1 | 5.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| CHEVROLET | 3.1 | V6 | A | 8.1 | 25.7 | 20.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| INFINITI | 4.5 | V8 | A | 3.9 | 13.4 | 8.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| CHRYSLER | 3.3 | V6 | A | 7.1 | 11.5 | 26.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| PLYMOUTH | 2.5 | L4 | A | 15.5 | 34.1 | 41.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| PONTIAC | 3.1 | V6 | A | 10.7 | 26.7 | 23.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| DODGE | 2.5 | L4 | A | 16.3 | 37.0 | 39.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| FORD | 2.3 | L4 | A | 3.5 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| FORD/MAZDA | 3.0 | V6 | A | 4.4 | 6.3 | 10.2 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| PONTIAC | 5.0 | V8 | A | 13.8 | 24.0 | 25.9 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |



Passing Vehicle ASM Emissions Were Also Used to Assess Potential for Cutpoint Changes

- Fast-pass algorithm makes a direct examination of passing vehicle emissions problematic.
- Passing vehicle ASM scores (as a fraction of the current cutpoint) were split up into four separate groups, or quartiles, and the cleanest 25% were analyzed.
- A low Q1 score (e.g., 15% of the cutpoint) suggests properly functioning vehicles easily meet current cutpoints.
- A high Q1 score (e.g., 60% of the cutpoint) suggests the cleaner vehicles in the group are struggling to meet current cutpoints.

Cutpoint Scenarios

- Three cutpoint scenarios were evaluated:
 - Scenario 1 = $\text{RFR} \leq 1.5$ and $\text{Q1 Score} < 0.5$
 - Scenario 2 = $\text{RFR} \leq 1.25$ and $\text{Q1 Score} < 0.5$
 - Scenario 3 = $\text{RFR} \leq 1.0$ and $\text{Q1 Score} < 0.5$
- A maximum reduction of 30% in cutpoint level was established based on a review of the CCR.
- Revised cutpoints were calculated as follows (by pollutant and test mode):

$$\text{Revised CP} = \text{Current CP} \times \max(\text{Q1}/0.5, 0.7)$$

Concern: Use of Non-CA Data

- Concern has been expressed that differing emissions standards between CA and AZ/WI may impact results.
- While it is true that some vehicle groups may have been certified to slightly different standards, this should have minimal impact on the analysis because:
 - Many of the vehicles in this timeframe (pre-1996 MY) were equipped with "50-state" engine families.
 - The age of the vehicles analyzed make vehicle "migration" more likely (for both CA and non-CA fleets).
 - The analysis was based on relative failure rates, which mitigates differences in standards.



Concern: Marginal Emitters are Targeted

- Concern has been expressed that tighter standards only capture marginal emitters.
- This is true in some cases, but the approach used in this analysis was intended to identify a subset of vehicles that pass current ASM cutpoints but fail during transient testing.
- Based on an analysis of ARB surveillance data, the vehicle-specific cutpoints successfully identified additional high-emitters (see next slide).

**Vehicles in ARB Surveillance Data Set that
Passed Current ASM Cutpoints but Failed Vehicle-Specific Cutpoints**

| Model Year | Make | Model | Cyl | Disp | Trans | Fail with RFR: | | | Multiple of FTP Standard | | |
|------------|-----------|------------------|-----|------|-------|----------------|-------|------|--------------------------|------|-----|
| | | | | | | <1.5 | <1.25 | <1.0 | HC | CO | NOx |
| 1978 | CHEVROLET | Caprice Classic | 8 | 5.0 | A | 1 | | | 3.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| 1981 | CHEVROLET | G2500 Van 2WD | 8 | 5.0 | A | 1 | 1 | | 3.2 | 4.4 | 1.7 |
| 1983 | GMC | G2500 Van 2WD | 8 | 5.0 | A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 1.5 |
| 1984 | BUICK | Skylark Custom | 6 | 2.8 | A | 1 | | | 1.1 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| 1984 | CHRYSLER | New Yorker | 4 | 2.2 | A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| 1985 | HONDA | Accord | 4 | 1.8 | M | 1 | 1 | | 10.8 | 12.8 | 0.3 |
| 1986 | TOYOTA | Celica | 4 | 2.0 | A | 1 | 1 | | 3.0 | 2.9 | 1.3 |
| 1987 | NISSAN | Sentra | 4 | 1.6 | A | 1 | 1 | | 3.3 | 3.2 | 1.1 |
| 1988 | TOYOTA | Camry | 4 | 2.0 | A | 1 | 1 | | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.2 |
| 1990 | DODGE | Caravan | 6 | 3.3 | A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| 1990 | FORD | F150 Regular Cab | 8 | 5.0 | A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 0.9 |
| 1990 | HONDA | Accord | 4 | 2.2 | M | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.5 |
| 1990 | PLYMOUTH | Voyager | 6 | 3.0 | A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.4 |
| 1990 | TOYOTA | Corolla | 4 | 1.6 | A | 1 | | | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.3 |
| 1991 | FORD | Explorer XL 4WD | 6 | 4.0 | A | 1 | 1 | | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.6 |
| 1991 | FORD | Taurus L | 6 | 3.0 | A | 1 | 1 | | 1.2 | 0.7 | 2.9 |
| 1991 | HONDA | Accord | 4 | 2.2 | M | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 2.2 |
| 1991 | INFINITI | G20 | 4 | 2.0 | A | 1 | | | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| 1991 | TOYOTA | Camry | 4 | 2.0 | A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| 1992 | PONTIAC | Grand Am LE | 6 | 3.3 | A | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 0.6 | 2.4 |
| 1993 | CHEVROLET | C1500 Pickup 2WD | 6 | 4.3 | A | 1 | | | 1.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| 1993 | CHEVROLET | Lumina | 6 | 3.1 | A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| 1993 | MINI | Cooper | 4 | 1.8 | A | 1 | 1 | | 1.5 | 0.5 | 2.3 |
| 1994 | HONDA | Accord | 4 | 2.2 | M | 1 | 1 | | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| 1994 | NISSAN | Pathfinder | 6 | 3.0 | A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 |

Impact on Smog Check Failure Rates

- Roadside data (full duration ASMs) were used to establish a ratio of failure rates under revised and current cutpoints.
- Those ratios were applied to Smog Check failure rates to estimate the impact of the revised cutpoints.
- Resulting failure rates (April to June 2004 data):
 - Current Cutpoints: 10.4%
 - Scenario 1: 12.8%
 - Scenario 2: 12.4%
 - Scenario 3: 11.9%



Impact on Statewide Emissions

(Tons per Day in CY2010 in Enhanced Areas)

Before/after-repair FTP/ASM data from ARB were used in conjunction with EMFAC2002 to estimate statewide emissions benefits of more stringent cutpoints.

| Scenario | ROG | NO _x | ROG+NO _x |
|------------|-----|-----------------|---------------------|
| Scenario 1 | 2.7 | 5.1 | 7.8 |
| Scenario 2 | 2.6 | 4.8 | 7.4 |
| Scenario 3 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 5.5 |